

Date: Sun, 15 Aug 93 04:30:05 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #981  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Sun, 15 Aug 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 981

Today's Topics:

    Converting to three hole plugs from two-hole plugs  
        Handhelds on airplane (2 msgs)  
        Handhelds on airplanes  
    Mobile xmitters and Auto warranties  
        new ham?  
    The WAR    was(Re: Code learning questions)  
    Why need a separate Antenna for receive ?  
        Yaesu FT-530 opinions

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Sat, 14 Aug 1993 14:54:40 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!portal!lhaven.UUmh.Ab.Ca!dreamer@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Converting to three hole plugs from two-hole plugs  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug9.142049.21718@walter.cray.com>, Walter Spector writes:

> >  
> >: My new(?) house is 38 years old and has (mostly) two prong (no ground)  
> >: AC-outlets.  
> >  
>  
> I've got a similar situation with my 'new' 42 year old house. So I've  
> been contemplating selective rewiring in the house as well. Fortunately  
> the garage and workshop (ham shack) were wired in the '70s and are

> all 3-wire. (But the polarities were reversed on about half the outlets.  
> I fixed that within a week of moving in... I'd recommend anyone buying an  
> an older house to buy a cheap polarity tester (\$5.00) from any hardware  
> store and test all the outlets!)  
>  
> My question is:  
>  
> Is it legal (NEC) to simply wire the green to a cold water pipe  
> since the pipe is connected to the earth ground anyway?  
>  
> In a book I purchased on house wiring, it mentioned this practice is OK  
> for \*upgrades\*, but not on new wiring. There are already at least two  
> examples of this in the house - one in the kitchen and one in the laundry  
> area. I plan on redoing the washing machine outlet ASAP.

I can't say if running a ground to a cold water pipe is acceptable under the NEC,  
since I don't have that book....and my CEC guide is at work.

But, under both NEC and CEC you can replace a two-prong outlet with a 3-prong  
GFCI outlet. This doesn't give you a protective ground, but relies on the GFCI  
to detect a fault.

You'll still need a good ground from somewhere else anyways.

--

"Just a Crazy Engineer with an Amiga and an HP48sx" - The Dreamer  
Email: dreamer@lhaven.uumh.ab.ca or "Lawrence Chen" @ 1:134/3002  
PHONE: +1 403 526 6019 FAX: +1 403 529 5102 CIS: 74200,2431  
Lunatic Haven BBS: +1 403 526 6957 | Packet: @VE6FRM.#HAT.AB.CAN.NA  
Praxis Society K12 BBS: +1 403 529 1610 | Callsign: VE6LKC

-----  
Date: 15 Aug 93 02:28:35 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!transfer.stratus.com!jjmhome!  
schunix!ksr@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Handhelds on airplane  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I've been doing a fair amount of air travel lately, always with at least one  
HT. The variation between airports, and even between security personnel at  
tge same airport, is amazing. Usually, they simply ask me to "make it do  
something", apparently on the assumption that there can't be room in it  
for both a weapon/infernal machine and a radio. On occasion, I've had them  
ask me to take the battery off (to check to see if it's a secret compart-  
ment). Often, they simply ignore it. With the increasing popularity of  
hand-held cellphones, they're seeing a lot of people carrying similar-  
looking units. In fact, I'm often reminded not to use my "phone" in

flight (a warning, by the way, that's equally valid for the HT).

If you have a problem, by the way, ask to speak to a representative of the airline. Generally, arguing with someone who is under-trained, under-paid, and is likely to be a State Trooper wannabe with just enough authority to be annoying is at best counterproductive! The airline people, on the other hand, have an interest in keeping you coming back.

Kevin

--

Kevin Sullivan

krs@world.std.com

WA1KLN

CAP: Freedom 7

PP/ASEL - IA

MA0007@MAWG.NER.CAP.GOV

-----  
Date: Sun, 15 Aug 1993 08:46:08 GMT

From: omen!caf@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Handhelds on airplane

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <24gagrINN9pa@rave.larc.nasa.gov> kludge@grissom.larc.nasa.gov (Scott Dorsey) writes:

>In article <745239098.AA09032@mtlnet.org> Mike.Bracci@f103.n416.z17.mtlnet.org (Mike Bracci) writes:

>>Quoting [Jeffrey] to [All] Subject: [Handhelds on airplanes]

>>

>> JRL> I have recently flown with my 2m HT in my carry on luggage.

>> JRL> I went from Ithaca,NY to RI through Laguardia, NYC. I had

>> JRL> no problem at all, and did NOT have to take it out and show

>> JRL> anyone. My carryons did go through the xray machine but must

>> JRL> have not looked suspicious enough.

>>

>> That's interesting Jeff, when I left on holiday for Hilton Head, the

>> security folks made me PRODUCE a license and prove that it was indeed

>> a handheld transceiver. That's in Toronto, and I thought American

>> officials were paraniod! :)

The last time I flew into Canada a Canadian officer politely but thoroughly hand inspected my baggage. I got the distinct impression this chap knew what he was doing.

On the other hand I don't recall any inspection when I boarded a twin turboprop at Rhinelander. I think it was one of those puddle jumpers with the tail that falls off, so why bother :--)

--

Chuck Forsberg WA7KGX                   ...!tektronix!reed!omen!caf  
Author of YMODEM, ZMODEM, Professional-YAM, ZCOMM, and DSZ  
Omen Technology Inc     "The High Reliability Software"  
17505-V NW Sauvie IS RD   Portland OR 97231   503-621-3406

-----  
Date: Sat, 14 Aug 1993 15:03:18 GMT  
From: usc!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!emory!  
rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Handhelds on airplanes  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <draveyCBq228.8sG@netcom.com> dravey@netcom.com (Donald Ravey) writes:  
>Another way to look at this is from the view of the airlines/airport/govt.  
>1. In these times of terrorism and crazies, is it such a bad tradeoff to  
> inflict a trivial amount of inconvenience, even to a lot of innocent  
> people, to significantly improve the chances of detecting dangerous  
> objects? Sure, you may argue that some actions DON'T significantly  
> improve the chances of detection, but I doubt that we could ever get  
> agreement on that. I, for one, would prefer to be conservative on  
> such safety matters.

I think Ben Franklin said it best when he said "Those who would trade liberty for the promise of security deserve neither liberty nor security." This airport thing is a small inconvenience to most of us, but it's the little inconveniences, piled one on top of another, that finally result in big losses of liberty. We are being whittled away from all sides for all reasons, most innocuous sounding on the surface when considered individually, so that we find ourselves constrained on every side.

People aren't crazier today than in the past, and terrorism isn't new. What's changed is the instant communication that makes these rare events seem commonplace and personally threatening. And what's changed is that a very personal cowardice, a loss of nerve, has enveloped the American spirit. We're no longer willing to take responsibility for our own security. We demand others do it for us while letting them strip us of the tools to do it ourselves.

>2. Is it reasonable to expect airport security (notoriously underpaid and  
> untrained) to understand ANY radio knowledge, much less HAM radio?  
> The airports have to give them simple rules to follow. Remember,  
> they have to watch out for lots of other things besides radios.

If security were worth doing, it would be worth doing right. But it's clearly not being done with seriousness. So we wind up with unnecessary hassles and a \*false\* sense of security.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: Sat, 14 Aug 1993 22:06:50 -0500  
From: panix!news.intercon.com!horton.intercon.com@nyu.arpa  
Subject: Mobile xmitters and Auto warranties  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug13.152843.19874@mixcom.mixcom.com>, kevin.jessup  
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>  
> I've heard stories of higher power (35 Watts an up) mobile 2-meter and  
> 70cm rigs causing the microcomputer based engine control modules in  
> automobiles to fail. I've also heard that the warranties on these  
> units are void if you have a ham mobile rig in your car. Is this  
> true and if so, which automobile manufacturers?

Well, the one true story I have in this regard isn't about warranties, but  
about the actual technical problem.

Back in 1985, I was driving my 1979 Audi 5000 on the Washington, DC area  
beltway, with a friend in the front seat. The traffic was fairly light, and I  
had the cruise control on.

My friend fired up his Icom 2AT, and I thought I noticed something funny with  
the car's behavior, but I couldn't pinpoint it. My friend leaned a bit  
forward for one reason or another, and keyed it up again, a bit longer  
(talking to someone), and my car FLOORED itself, accelerating to about 75 mph  
in a fairly short period.

We then tested our hypothesis that it was the hand-held, and discovered that  
there were "hot spots" where a keyed-up radio would make the car speed, or  
wouldn't do anything at all.

It didn't seem to do anything when the cruise control wasn't on. I can't help  
but wonder how much of the "unintended acceleration" problems that people  
blamed on Audis were due to some weenie with a CB and a "leenyur" amplifier,  
or a cell phone, or some other RF source. As I recall, Audi never could find  
a good reason for the "unintended acceleration" problem, and resorted to  
putting a safety switch that required a foot on a brake when shifting into

gear from the park setting.

Bob Stratton  
Engineer, InterCon Systems Corp.  
<strat@intercon.com>

Disclaimer: No one pays me enough to own my opinions.

-----  
Date: Sat, 14 Aug 1993 15:19:36 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!  
gary@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: new ham?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug14.054128.8956@bongo.tele.com> julian@bongo.tele.com (Julian Macassey) writes:

>In article <sanjeev.11.000D9CDF@anest4.anest.ufl.edu>

sanjeev@anest4.anest.ufl.edu (Sanjeev Sawai) writes:

>>How does one become a ham?

>

> A good pickling in nitrites and a good, long, cool, smoking

>usually does the best job.

I've been doing that for over 30 years now. It seems to work. :-)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----  
Date: Sat, 14 Aug 1993 14:46:39 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!  
gary@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: The WAR was(Re: Code learning questions)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CBppFD.Ir6@srngenprp.sr.hp.com> alanb@sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

>Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:

>

>: It \*used\* to work that way though. There was one permanent license,  
>: General, and it was good for all amateur privileges. (Well, Tech  
>: \*existed\* but you rarely met one.) Then the ARRL lobbied the FCC and  
>: changed things to the complex mess we have today.

>

>Correction. The complex mess we have today is the FCC's doing, not the  
>ARRL's. The original ARRL incentive licensing petition was simply  
>to reinstate the old Advanced Amateur class license with exclusive  
>privileges on a couple of the phone bands. The Balkanization of  
>the bands into little sub-bands was the FCC's idea, not ARRL's.

A. Prose Walker's idea to be exact. But it was the ARRL petition  
that got the whole mess stirred up. \*Now\* they tell us not to  
involve the FCC in matters best handled ourselves, such as self  
training. Maybe they're beginning to get a clue that it's not  
wise to wake the bear on issues that're likely to result in  
more restrictions.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: Sat, 14 Aug 1993 14:40:12 GMT

From: usc!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!emory!  
rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Why need a separate Antenna for receive ?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <gtaylor.207.745265412@taex003n.tamu.edu> gtaylor@taex003n.tamu.edu  
(Gregory S. Taylor) writes:

>In article <1993Aug13.105202.5369@uoft02.utoledo.edu> mohan@tulip (Mohan  
Pakkurti) writes:

>>Subject: Why need a separate Antenna for receive ?

>

>Don't need it for this purpose on the 1000 but I put one in my xcvr so I  
>could use an aux receiver for split operation (old technology).

It's also a great feature if you plan to use transverters for serious  
VHF/UHF operating. It was one of the selling points of the IC735 for  
me.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: Sat, 14 Aug 1993 15:07:13 GMT  
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!portal!lhaven.UUmh.Ab.Ca!dreamer@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Yaesu FT-530 opinions  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <jfhCBII3I.Dp9@netcom.com>, Jack Hamilton writes:

> srtest@netcom.com (Sunrise Test Systems) wrote:  
>  
> >On intermod: yes, it does suffer, especially here in Silicon-high-RF-Valley.  
> >The Yaesu factory mod and the new antenna helped quite a bit, though.  
>  
> Which band's intermod does the factory mod purport to fix? Did they say  
> what they did, or did they just say "it's better now"?  
>  
How do I go about determining if my FT530 is a candidate for this intermod fix,  
and how do I go about getting it performed?

I was up in Calgary on holidays, and Intermod problems were pretty bad.

--

"Just a Crazy Engineer with an Amiga and an HP48sx" - The Dreamer  
Email: dreamer@lhaven.uumh.ab.ca or "Lawrence Chen" @ 1:134/3002  
PHONE: +1 403 526 6019 FAX: +1 403 529 5102 CIS: 74200,2431  
Lunatic Haven BBS: +1 403 526 6957 | Packet: @VE6FRM.#HAT.AB.CAN.NA  
Praxis Society K12 BBS: +1 403 529 1610 | Callsign: VE6LKC

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #981

\*\*\*\*\*